

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/020,026 | 12/14/2001 | Glenn Darrell Batalden | ROC920010306US1 | 8987 |
| 7590 06/21/2006 | | | EXAMINER | |
| Gero G. McClellan | | | ZHOU, TING | |
| Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P. | | | | |
| Suite 1500 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 3040 Post Oak Boulevard | | | 2173 | |
| Houston, TX 77056-6582 | | | DATE MAILED: 06/21/2006 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/020,026 | BATALDEN ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Ting Zhou | 2173 | |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 07 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below): (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) X will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-4,7,9-15,17,20-26,28 and 30-36. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____. AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. / Those the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). Kreuden la 13. Other: ____. KIEU D. VU

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments have been fully considered, however, they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that in Yen, once the first sub window display 52 is opened, the first main window 46 fails to control a "functional" aspect of the controlled browser window. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Yen teaches that when the first main window shifts, the first sub-window shifts accordingly, and when the first main window is closed, the first sub-window is correspondingly closed, as recited on page 4, paragraph 0052 and claim 1; therefore, the first main window controls functional aspects of the first sub-window, such as whether the first sub-window is open or closed. Furthermore, the applicant also argues that when Yen and Hodginkinson are combined, the graphical user interface of Yen would continue to render information in the first sub window display in response to user request without changing the predetermined response. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Hodgkinson teaches the input of a user selection causing a need for the layout of the displayed page to change, therefore, the displayed page had a predetermined response of changing the layout of the page, i.e. reformatting the page during the reception of data when user input is received (page 2, paragraph 15). Hodgkinson further teaches deferring changing of the layout, i.e. reformatting the page until a later time, such as when a certain amount of data for the new page has been received (page 2, paragraph 15). In other words, Hodgkinson teaches that instead of executing the predetermined response of reformatting the page when the user input is received, a response other than the predetermined response, such as performing the reformatting at a later time, is executed. Therefore, when the GUI of Yen is combined with Hodgkinson, when the user interacts with the first sub-window, the predetermined response of reformatting the page will be overriding and the reformatting will happen at a later time, instead of when the user input is received. The applicant's arguments have not placed the application in condition for allowance, and the pending claims remain rejected according to the final office action dated 4/7/2006.